REMARKS

I. Interview with Examiner

Applicants would like to extend their sincere thanks to the Examiner for conducting a telephonic interview on July 12, 2005. The Examiner indicated in the Interview Summary that amending the pending independent claims to include the limitations of claims 2 and 6 (as appropriate) would overcome the cited references.

II. Rejection of Claims 1- 35 Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-3, 5-8 and 10-35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hoover in view of Lamburt. As suggested by the Examiner, applicants have amended claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 12, 13-26, and 28-35. Claims 2, 5, 6, 8, 10, and 27 have been cancelled.

An aspect of the invention, represented by claims 1 and 7, is directed to a technique for on-the-fly updating of search output that is responsive to a query. This is accomplished by comparing responsive database records from databases with a responsive update record from an update database associated with such databases. In instances where there are more than one responsive database records that correspond to (*e.g.*, records that are the same or substantially the same as) the update record, the database records are excluded from the search output when the update record includes a predefined setting (e.g., a delete setting). Because the claimed invention excludes records based on a setting in the update record, circumstances in which the user receives extraneous query output can be effectively controlled.

Excluding one or more selected records from the responsive records effectuates the update, or deletion, of one or more records that are responsive to a query. Records that are stored in the searchable databases, however, are not updated or deleted. The inventive technique therefore enables responsive records to be updated, or excluded, on-the-fly based upon the parameters of the search request and the update database data.

Another aspect of the invention, represented by claims 12, 20 and 29, is directed to a technique for routing search requests. The technique includes searching a routing database to determine whether a search request should be routed to databases accessible by the receiving

server. If it is determined that the search request should be routed to one or more of such databases, the search request is routed to the databases to effectuate the user's search. Search results are then returned to the user. The claimed invention does not require receipt of two sets of input from the user to identify the appropriate databases for searching and for performing the query searching as in prior art. Rather, the claimed invention allows performing both operations using the same, or a subset of the, search request data provided by the user.

Hoover discloses a method and system for object-based relational distributed databases. Lamburt discloses data merging techniques. As agreed by the Examiner during the Interview, independent claims 1, 7, 12, 20 and 29, as amended, which now incorporate relevant features of claims 2 and 6 are patentable over the cited art. Also patentable are claims 3, 11, 13-19, 21-26, 28, and 30-35 by virtue of their dependency from the amended independent claims.

As requested by the Examiner, applicants enclose herewith copies of Information Disclosure Statements by Applicant containing references which were considered and initialed by the Examiner.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, each of claims 1, 3, 7, 11, 12, 13-26, and 28-35, as amended, is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration of these claims is requested and allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully,

Dated: July 18, 2005   By: _____
Enclosures   Alex L. Yip
                                             Attorney for Applicants
                                             Registration No. 34,759
                                             212-836-7363